



## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.		FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCK	ET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
	09/681,311	03	3/16/2001	Milton Silva-Craig	13036US0	13036US01		2494
	23446 7	7590	03/07/2006		EXAMINER			
	MCANDREV	VS HEL	D & MALLO	GILL	GILLIGAN, CHRISTOPHER L			
	500 WEST MA	ADISON	STREET					_
	SUITE 3400				ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER	
	CHICAGO, II	60661			3626			•

DATE MAILED: 03/07/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)			
09/681,311	SILVA-CRAIG ET AL.			
Examiner	Art Unit			
Luke Gilligan	3626			

	Luke Gilligan		3626						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appear	ers on the cover s	sheet with the d	orrespondence add	ress					
THE REPLY FILED 06 February 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	APPLICATION IN	CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE.						
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Not a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:	ing replies: (1) an ice of Appeal (with	amendment, aff appeal fee) in o	idavit, or other eviden compliance with 37 Cl	ce, which FR 41.31; or (3)					
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	-								
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Acono event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la	ter than SIX MONTH	IS from the mailing	g date of the final rejection	on.					
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (to TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 70	6.07(f).								
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extra under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the siset forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corre hortened statutory p	sponding amount eriod for reply origi	of the fee. The appropri inally set in the final Office	ate extension fee be action; or (2) as					
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exten a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed.</li> </ol>	sion thereof (37 C	FR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th						
AMENDMENTS		6 <i>6</i> 11 b-1-6							
<ol> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be</li> <li>They raise new issues that would require further con</li> </ol>				ecause					
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below		search (see 140	i L Delow),						
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or		by materially re	ducing or simplifying	he issues for					
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a c	orresponding num	ber of finally rej	ected claims.						
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.11	6 and 41.33(a)).								
<ol> <li>The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12</li> </ol>	1. See attached N	lotice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (	PTOL-324).					
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):	•								
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be alled non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>		•	·	J					
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			ll be entered and an e	xplanation of					
Claim(s) allowed: <u>NONE</u> .									
Claim(s) objected to: <u>NONE</u> .									
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-50</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>NONE</u> .									
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE									
8.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	before or on the o sufficient reasons	date of filing a No why the affidav	otice of Appeal will <u>no</u> it or other evidence is	t be entered necessary and					
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to ov showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejecti	ons under appea	al and/or appellant fai	ls to provide a					
10.  The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	of the status of th	ie claims after ei	ntry is below or attach	ed.					
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER				•					
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u></li> </ol>	•			ice because:					
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	PTO/SB/08 or PTO	D-1449) Paper N	lo(s)						
13. Other:	922								
13. [] Other:  JOSEPH THO	21112								
	SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER								
SUPERVISORY PALE	NIEXAMINEM								

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The changes to the independent claims, such as creating associations, would require a further search and consideration of the prior art and, therefore, will not be entered After Final.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: In the remarks filed 2/6/06, Applicants argue in substance that the applied prior art does not teach certain featrues of the claims as amended and that Wong does not teach storing references to medical information or medical images.

In response to Applicants' arguments, it is respectfull submitted that the arguments with respect to the claims as amended are moot because the amendments have not been entered After Final. With respect to the teachings of Wong, it is respectfully submitted that since the term "link" has not been defined within the claims, the term has been given its broadest reasonable interpretation to one of ordinary skill in the art. Therefore, it is submitted that the stored references to the image objects and report objects are a form of "link" to images and information as recited in the claim. Furthermore, it is noted that claims 16 and 17 refer to links that represent the location of images and information. Therefore, it is respectfully maintained that the URL of Wong, which is a link representing the location of the server, meets these limitations.